

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 21-24, 26, 30-32, and 38-47 have been examined and stand rejected. By the above amendments, claims 1, 8, 17, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 38-42, 45, and 46 have been amended, claim 47 has been canceled, and new claims 48-59 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 21-24, 26, 30-32, 38-46, and 48-59 now are pending in the subject application. Support for the new dependent claims and the claim amendments can be found in FIGs. 2 and 3, and from page 8, line 19, through the end of page 11 of the present application as filed. Favorable reconsideration of the application and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action:

- Claims 1, 5, 17, 23, 38, 40, 41, 44, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Optical metropolitan networks – an overview” to Grobe in view of “Mapping SMTPE 259 into ATM structure” to Safar in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,764 to Noritomi in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0100958 to Peng;
- Claims 6, 7, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grobe in view of Safar in further view of Noritomi in further view of Peng in further view of “Virtual Concatenations + LCAS” to Olsson;
- Claims 8, 14, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grobe in view of Noritomi in further view of Safar in further view of Peng in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,135 to Suzuki;
- Claims 10, 24, 26, 30, 39, 46, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grobe in view of Noritomi in further view of Safar in further view of Peng in further view of Suzuki in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,073 to Nichols;

- Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grobe in view of Noritomi in further view of Safar in further view of Peng in further view of Suzuki in further view of Olsson;
- Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grobe in view of Noritomi in further view of Safar in further view of Peng in further view of Suzuki in further view of Nichols in further view of Olsson.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended herein, is directed to a method for receiving one or more video data streams at an interface configured to insert serial video data and packetized digital video into a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard by way of first and second processing chains respectively. Individual ones of the one or more video streams are processed via the first processing chain when individual ones of the one or more video streams comprise serial video data, where processing comprises identifying horizontal scan lines in the serial video data stream, identifying vertical blanking intervals in the serial video data stream, and computing a payload header of N bytes for each data payload, where N is a provisionable value, including a two byte time stamp counter value and an associated two byte CRC value. The horizontal scan lines and the payload headers are encapsulated into generic framing procedure transparent mode (GFP-T) frames. The GFP-T frames are mapped into the network transport digital signal in accordance with the hierarchical digital transmission standard. GFP-T idle frames are inserted into the network transport digital signal during the identified vertical blanking intervals. Independent claims 17 and 38 are amended herein to recite analogous subject matter. Independent claims 8, 24, and 39 are directed toward performing the inverse of the above described operation and are amended herein to recite the subject matter of the inverse operation.

All of the claims were rejected under a combination of Grobe and three or more remaining references. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Grobe provides an overview of optical DWDM networks. The overview includes present and *future* plans for these optical networks. As disclosed on page 28, first column, last paragraph:

“Table 1 list the most important services that can *or will be* found in metropolitan environments”

Thus, inserting a SMTPE-259M video stream into an optical protocol was something merely envisioned by Grobe, and hence is not a definitive teaching or suggestion with respect to the claims of the present application. Therefore, Applicant submits inserting serial video data into a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard is not taught by Grobe’s speculation about future metropolitan environments. To further this point, at the time the present application was filed, GFP-T frames were already provisioned for including *packetized* digital video (e.g., see page 2, lines 2-4 of the present application as filed).. Grobe makes no teaching of inserting *serialized* video into an optical protocol frame.

In addition, the Examiner also alleges that Grobe’s disclosure teaches the claim limitation “computing a payload header of N bytes for each data payload, where N is a provisionable value, including a two byte time stamp counter value and an associated two byte CRC value; forming GFP-T frames with data payloads and corresponding payload headers; and mapping said GFP-T frames into said network transport digital signal in accordance with said hierarchical digital transmission standard.” Applicant has made a thorough search of Grobe and finds no such disclosure.

Furthermore, none of the cited art (Grobe, Safar, Noritomi, Peng, Suzuki, Olsson, or Nichols) alone or in combination discloses, teaches or suggests:

- an interface configured to insert serial video data and packetized digital video into a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard by way of first and second processing chains respectively; and

- identifying vertical blanking intervals in the serial video data stream and inserting GFP-T idle frames into the network transport digital signal during the identified vertical blanking intervals.

Moreover, none of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests the following with respect to the inverse operation:

- an interface configured to demap, decapsulate, buffer, clock out, and multiplex serial video data and packetized digital video from a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard; and
- remove GFP-T idle frames from the network transport digital signal that identify vertical blanking intervals.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to find the application to be in condition for allowance with claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 21-24, 26, 30-32, 38-46, and 48-59. However, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees required for the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 05-0460.

Dated: April 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted by:

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER NO. 27896
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

/D. Andrew Floam/
D. Andrew Floam
Reg. No. 34597